

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-18, 20-32, 34, 36-47, and 49-54 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action and traverse all rejections. Applicants amend claims 1, 8, 14, and 15

Claim Objections

Claims 15-16 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants amend claim 15 so that “a first code” is changed to “the first code.”

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants amend claims 1, 14, and 8 to correct the informalities.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 7-8, 14, 20, 22, 26, 34, 41, 49, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haskell (US 5,159,447).

All of Applicants’ claims are novel and patentable over Haskell because Haskell does not recite all features of Applicants’ claims. For example, Applicants’ claim 1 includes the feature “encoding said multiplexed content with a second code to provide a set of frames, wherein the encoding said multiplexed content comprises identifying a block of bits to be encoded and then coding the block of bits with the second code.” Haskell instead teaches a channel interface 80 which “removes from bit-stream CODEIM a predetermined number of bits.” Further, the “number of bits to be removed from each frame of bit stream CODEIM so as to produce bit-stream CODETR is determined by the difference between the actual bit-rate Ri made available by variable rate channel 30.” Please see Haskell col. 3 lines 11-51. Therefore Haskell’s teaching is distinct from “encoding said multiplexed content with a second code to provide a set of frames, wherein the encoding said multiplexed content comprises identifying a block of bits to be encoded and then coding the block of bits with the second code” as in Applicants’ claim.

Therefore all of Applicants’ claims are novel and patentable over Haskell.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

As discussed above, Haskell does not recite the features of Applicants' claims as used in the above 35 USC 102 rejections. As those alleged aspects of Haskell were also used in the 35 USC 103 rejections, all of Applicants' claims are patentable over Haskell and Naden, Haskell and Chen, and Haskell and Naden and Chen

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 2, 2006

By: /Rupit Patel/
Rupit Patel, Reg. No. 53,441
858.651.7435

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-7435
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502